DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 396 RC 023 641

AUTHOR	Bishop, Russell
TITLE	Collaborative Storytelling: Meeting Indigenous Peoples' Desires for Self-Determination in Research.
PUB DATE	1999-07-00
NOTE	30p.; In: Indigenous Education around the World: Workshop Papers from the World Indigenous People's Conference: Education (Albuquerque, New Mexico, June 15-22, 1996); see RC 023 640.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cultural Context; Cultural Relevance; *Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; *Maori (People); *Participatory Research; *Research Methodology; Research Projects; Self Determination; World Views
IDENTIFIERS	New Zealand; Protocols; *Researcher Subject Relationship

ABSTRACT

Maori and other indigenous peoples are concerned about the power and control that non-indigenous people hold over research. Research issues such as initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation, and accountability have usually been determined by the researcher's interests and agenda. One means of addressing indigenous peoples' desire for self-determination in educational research is to develop collaborative storytelling as a research approach. Such an approach, when conducted within indigenous ways of knowing, facilitates ongoing collaborative analysis and construction of meaning about participants' lived experiences. Collaborative stories are selected, recollected, and reflected on by research participants (including the researcher), then merged to create a collaborative text--a mutually constructed story created out of the lived experiences of all participants. Five collaborative research projects conducted by the bicultural research group of the University of Otago (New Zealand) are described. These projects involved: (1) representing Otago Maori parents' aspirations for their children's education to national policy makers; (2) addressing systemic change through "spiral discourse" within a College of Education; (3) developing a reading tutoring procedure and offering it to Maori groups as a traditional "koha"--a gift that may be accepted or refused; (4) family history and genealogy; and (5) evaluating characteristics of Maori programs in mainstream schools that indicate success. These examples demonstrate how the researchers became located within new "story-lines" that used metaphor and imagery from the research participants' domain. (Contains 39 references.) (Author/SV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 396

Collaborative Storytelling: Meeting Indigenous Peoples' desires for Self-Determination in Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ray Barnhardt
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Submitted By: **Russell Bishop**
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand

RC 023641

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Collaborative Storying:
Meeting Indigenous Peoples' Desires for Self -Determination in Research.

Russell Bishop
Senior Lecturer in Education
University of Otago.
Box 56,
Dunedin, New Zealand.

Phone: 64 3 4798616/4798803

Fax: 64 3 4798349

email: russell.bishop@stonebow.otago.ac.nz

Acknowledgments: I am very grateful to Professors Gunnar Stangvik, Lous Heshusius and Ted Glynn for their help and guidance when preparing this paper for an international audience.

Title: Collaborative Storying: Meeting Indigenous People's Desires for Self-Determination in Research.

Abstract

This analysis is undertaken from the position of a researcher who is a member of an indigenous minority, the Maori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand. Maori people, among other indigenous peoples, are concerned that research should address their desire for self-determination. This self-determination should be manifest in the way that research deals with Maori people's concerns about initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability.

This paper examines how researchers can address Maori concerns about research by collaboratively constructing stories about these experiences. Collaborative storying is a research approach which facilitates communicating, interpreting and giving meaning to people's lived experiences. Collaborative stories allow research participants to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language, rather than those chosen by the researcher. Collaborative story telling means that the stories of the research participants (and this includes the researcher) merge to create a collaborative text, a mutually constructed story created out of the lived experiences of the research participants.

This paper draws on current research into the experiences of a number of researchers working within a Maori research context, termed Kaupapa (agenda; philosophy) Maori framework. The focus is on the meanings they construct about their own experiences.

Title: Collaborative Storying: Meeting Indigenous People's Desires for Self_Determination in Research.

> *The main claim for the use of narrative in educational research is that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of the ways humans experience the world. (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 2)*

> *...my basic point being that stories are at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of the world; they also become the method colonised people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history (Edward Said, 1993, p. xii)*

1. Introduction

The traditional position of the researcher has been that of the story teller, the narrator, the person who decides what constitutes the narrative. Researchers in the past have taken the stories of research participants and have submerged them within their own stories. Indigenous peoples, such as the Maori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand express concern about the power and control that non-indigenous people hold over research.[1] Indigenous peoples are concerned that research issues such as initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation, and accountability have traditionally been determined by the imposition of the researcher's agenda, interests and concerns on the research process.

In Aotearoa/New Zealand the researcher as story teller has been an outsider who gathered the stories of 'others', collated them and generalised about the patterns and commonalities. This process has consequently denied the authenticity of Maori experiences, and voice. Such research has displaced Maori lived experiences, and the meanings that these experiences have, with the 'authoritative' voice of the 'expert' Further, many misconstrued Maori cultural practices and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Maori and non-Maori alike. Such practices perpetuate the ideology of cultural superiority that is fundamental to colonisation. This ideology precludes the development of power sharing processes, and the legitimation of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies.

Such domination is no longer acceptable. Nor is the research approach that encourages simply listening and recording other peoples' stories of experience, even though this might seem more appropriate than the researcher synthesising and reporting the story in his or her own words. However, such an approach ignores the difficulty of "stilling our theorising voices" (Connelly and Clandinin. 1990, p. 2). These authors suggest that we are constantly reflecting and seeking explanations for our experiences and the experiences of others. Yet, telling our stories as subjective voices is not without problems either. This approach ignores the impact that the stories of the other research participants have on our stories. Instead we need to acknowledge our participatory connectedness with the other research participants. We need to promote a means of knowing that avoids distance and separation and promotes commitment and engagement. Collaborative storying provides such a means.

2. Collaborative Storying

Collaborative storying addresses Maori people's concerns about research into their lives by recognising that other people involved in the research process are not just informants, but are participants who have meaningful experiences, concerns and questions. Collaborative storying also acknowledges that the researcher is positioned as a research participant within the process of storying and restorying that creates the narrative. Research participants become involved in the process of collaboration, of "mutual story-telling and re-storying as the research proceeds...a relationship in which both stories are heard." (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990, p. 4)

Collaborative storying uncovers the many experiences and 'voice' of the participants, emphasising complexities rather than commonalities. This emphasis on complexity is in opposition to the traditional notion of research as synthesising and simplifying, seeking to distil the essence, or kernels of truth. Complexity in stories increases the range of interpretations, knowledge and experiences available within research.

Collaborative storying is an approach in which people are able to recollect, reflect and make sense of their experiences within their own cultural context and in particular their own language. In such ways their interpretations and analyses become 'normal' and 'accepted' as opposed to those of the researcher. Indeed when indigenous ways of knowing become the context for research then the research goes beyond 'enabling others to find their own voices'. The context sets the pattern for subsequent interactions where the research participants engage in an interactive, complex, holistic approach to research. This

involves mutual telling and retelling of stories by people who are living those stories. The major implication for researchers is that they should be able to participate in these sense making contexts rather than simply expecting the research participants to engage with theirs.

Stories are a way of representing truth and meaning. Different stories give different versions of and approaches to truth and meaning. Stories allow the diversities of truth and meaning to be heard, rather than just one dominant version. Maori lawyer, Moana Jackson (1994), identifies story telling as having the power to define what and how knowledge is created. For example, at a societal level, Maori people controlled, protected and defined this land and the people on the basis of chiefly control and responsibility. The Treaty of Waitangi,[2] signed in 1840, was an attempt to identify the powers to protect and define what constituted knowledge and truth for both group of signatories. However, Maori stories of the Treaty are different from the stories presented by representatives of the Crown. The process of colonisation entailed the hegemonic imposition of stories created by the Crown over stories created by the Maori. Colonisation removed the right guaranteed to Maori people to protect and define their own stories. The Crown's story of New Zealand are of one people, of assimilation, integration and biculturalism. Maori stories are of colonisation, marginalisation and poverty.

There are strong preferences among Maori people for narrative as a form of cultural transmission. Story remains one of the common ways of imparting knowledge. Particular messages and proverbs are told in narrative form, or in waiata (song) moteatea (poetry) pakiwaitara (story) and kauwhau (moralistic tale). Some stories have to maintain strong criteria of accuracy, for example whakapapa (genealogy) and associated raranga korero (stories of genealogical figures and events). Other stories are meant to be embellished to maintain the interest that invoke the wairua (spirituality) and the mauri (life force) of the story. Stories vary from iwi to iwi (tribe), hapu to hapu (sub-tribe) as memories change and local circumstances dictate. The mana (power, prestige) of the story teller is expressed not only in the exact recitation of the words, but also in the power of their delivery. Among Maori people today, story remains a strongly culturally preferred medium of instruction. There is a wairua (spirituality) in story that binds the listener to the teller beyond any linkage created by the words on their own.

Just as at the societal level, storytelling at an individual level allows the story teller to retain the power to define what constitutes the story and the truth and the meaning it has. Stories are related within the cultural frame of reference and the language of the research participant, rather than those of the researcher. Further, while the story teller makes every endeavour to ensure understanding on the part of the listener, there is a real sense that it is

for the other to bring their own understandings to the interpretations. In this sense, the traditional position of researcher as interpreter and "conduit" from the research informant to listener/reader of the story is challenged.

3. The Research Project: Reflection on five research studies.

I became interested in reflecting on and documenting how researchers (including myself) addressed Maori people's concerns about research into their lives. My research sought to examine a way of knowing that focuses on connectedness, engagement, and involvement with research participants within the cultural world view within which they function. This research sought to examine concepts of participatory consciousness and connectedness within Maori discursive practice.

My project investigated five studies that were collaboratively conducted by members of the bicultural research group of the Education Department of the University of Otago (Bishop, 1991a). The research studies are:

a. The *Otago Maori Education Plan* This study sought to represent Otago Maori parent's aspirations for the education of their children to those involved in national policy making.

b. *Systemic change in a College of Education.* This study is an investigation of the process of addressing systemic change through 'spiral discourse' within a College of Education campus.

c. *Tatari Tautoko Tauawhi* This is the study of the development and trialing of a reading tutoring procedure, and of how it was offered as a koha (gift) to Maori groups, and subsequently implemented within Maori contexts.

d. *He Whakawhanaungatanga Tikanga Rua*: This study, undertaken by myself over a fifteen year period, is a multiple life history of a family diaspora[3] created by the impact of colonisation during the crucial decades[4] of New Zealand's history.

e, Tu mai kia Tu Ake This study is an evaluation of those characteristics of "Taha Maori" (Maoir perspectives) programmes in Otago and Southland mainstream schools that are indicative of success.

The research group consists of both Maori and non-Maori members. All the members are located within educational institutions. Among the group there is a common appreciation of the need to look beyond our institutions and institutional concerns in order to address the importance of devolving power and control in research. My project sought to examine what the experience of researching within a Kaupapa Maori[5] approach to research meant to the researchers. These understandings were investigated by co-constructing collaborative research stories about the collaborative stories that had been constructed

within each of the five research projects. The objective was to engage in a process of critical reflection and connect epistemological questions to indigenous ways of knowing within the context of actual research projects.

However, my objective was not to judge other researchers or their studies against a set of criteria that I had established. Rather, my idea was that, together, we could engage in a process of critical reflection on how we had addressed the issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation, and accountability when we undertook research.

The following specific questions [6] became the focus of discussions.

a. Initiation

Who initiated the research, and why? What were the goals of the project? Who set the goals? Who designed the work?

b. Benefits

What benefits will there be? Who gets the benefits? What assessment and evaluation procedures will be used to establish benefits? What difference will this study make for Maori? How does this study support Maori cultural and language aspirations? Who decides on the methods and procedures of assessment and evaluation?

c. Representation

What constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality? Whose interests, needs and concerns does the text represent? How were the goals and major questions of the study established? How were the tasks allocated? What agency do individuals or groups have? Whose voice is heard? Who did the work?

d. Legitimation

What authority does the text have? Who is going to process the data? Who is going to consider the results of the processing? What happens to the results? Who defines what is accurate, true and complete in a text? Who constructs theories to explain the findings?

e. Accountability

Who is the researcher accountable to? Who is to have accessibility to the research findings? Who has control over the distribution of the knowledge?

4. Cultural Processes involved in creating Collaborative Stories.

When undertaking research, the researchers in each of the five studies participated in specific Maori cultural practices, all of which are typically associated with the hui. The hui is a formal Maori meeting. The hui commences with a formal welcome, called a powhiri. This welcome is rich in cultural meaning and imagery. These practices fulfil the

enormously important cultural task of recognising the relative tapu (potentiality for power) and mana (power, prestige) of the two groups of people, the hosts and the visitors, who are physically and spiritually encountering each other. Once the formal welcome is complete, and the participants have been ritually joined together, hui participants move onto the discussion of the matter under consideration. This usually takes place within the meeting house. The meeting house is a place designated for this very purpose. It is a place free from distractions and interruptions. The meeting house is also symbolically the embodiment of an ancestor. Such understanding emphasises the appropriateness of somatic ways of knowing within such cultural settings and processes. There, participants address the matters under consideration, under the guidance of respected and authoritative elders (kaumatua). The primary function of the elders is to create and monitor the correct spiritual and procedural framework within which the participants discuss the issues before them. People get a chance to address issues without fear of being interrupted. Generally the procedure is for people to speak one after another, usually in sequence from left to right. People get a chance to state and restate their meanings, to revisit their meanings and to modify, delete and adapt their meanings according to local customs. The discourse spirals. The flow of talk may seem circuitous, opinions may vary and waver, but the seeking of a collaboratively constructed story is central. This takes time, days if need be, or sometimes a series of hui will be held in order that the kaumatua (elders) monitoring proceedings can tell when a group constructed 'voice' has been arrived at. The hui then concludes with final prayers and the sharing of food.[7] The controls over proceedings are both temporal and spiritual, as in all Maori cultural practices. The procedures are steeped in metaphoric meanings, richly abstract allusions being made constantly to cultural messages, stories, events of the past and aspirations for the future. The procedures are time proven and are governed by customs handed down from the ancestors (taonga tuku iho). To Maori people these procedures remain a highly effective means of dealing with contemporary issues and concerns of all kinds.

5. The first study: The story of the Otago Maori Education Plan

The process of developing the Otago Maori Education Plan is an example of how participating in cultural processes associated with the hui locates the determination over representation and legitimation issues within Maori ways of knowing.

The work of the two Resource Teachers of Maori (RTMs) in Otago involves them visiting schools primarily to help teachers understand and implement Maori programmes. These programmes are designed by national curriculum authorities. Although non-Maori themselves, the two resource teachers are each involved in Maori community concerns and

events. As a result of their involvement, it became apparent to them that new policies being developed by the national authorities were not meeting the aspirations of local Maori people. They were uncertain whether Otago parents of Maori children had ever been consulted about the future they wanted for their children.

They presented their concerns to the three mana whenua[8] runanga (councils of local Maori people) in Otago and asked what was the best way to address this problem. The response from the runanga (councils) was that it was timely that a working party address this issue, especially considering the recent changes in educational administration in New Zealand. These changes were causing concern to the local Maori councils because they involved devolution of decision making powers to the local school level. Yet at the same time, the national authority, the Ministry of Education retained control over curriculum and other policy matters. It was suggested that the working party consist of the two RTMs and a representative of each of the three local mana whenua runanga. In this way, the authority over decision making within the working party was appropriately located with the local mana whenua people.

The working party proposed two main initiatives. The first was that education service providers in Otago needed to be involved in order to provide information to the local people about current services and policies. The second was that the Otago Maori community needed to be consulted as to their aspirations for the education of their children. It was suggested that this take place at a series of regional hui (formal decision making meetings). The working party met with representatives of the education service providers in Otago and Southland[9] on a number of occasions in early 1993. From these meetings it was suggested to local Maori elders that they would like to hui (formally meet) with the local Maori communities. As a result, the local people called four hui throughout the Otago region.

Gathering a collective voice

The four regional hui followed a similar pattern; Powhiri, haruru, and kai (formal welcome, greeting and food). Then a chance was given to the visitors to lay down their ideas of what they had to offer, what they had to say. Following this, the host people spoke, asked questions and made their aspirations and needs known very clearly. The hui generally lasted four to five hours and concluded with a formal whakakapi. Whakakapi is a form of summary where kaumatua attempt to arrive at a consensual view of the proceedings. This was followed by poroporoaki (formal farewells) by the visitors. During the hui, full records were also taken by the RTMs to document the voices of the community.

Over the next six months, members of the working party consulted widely within the Maori communities and local and regional tribal councils. Then a draft of the collaborative story of the local communities' aspirations for the education of their children was written by the RTMs for the working party. This draft was then presented back to the local Maori communities by means of another round of regional hui, duplicating the process undertaken six months earlier. The draft story was endorsed by the representatives of the Maori communities as a fair representation of the aspirations and desires the local Maori communities have for the education of their children.

Consultation was then extended to the local and national level of the Ministry of Education. A draft of what was to become the Otago Maori People's Plan for Maori Education in Otago was presented to the Ministry of Education at a local marae by two leaders of Ngai Tahu iwi (the local tribe). This action clearly signalled that the Plan was an authoritative representation of the aspirations Otago parents of Maori children had for the future education of their children.

The Planning process continues. The Plan is being presented to local schools for consultation and presently local Marae are discussing how to incorporate these aspirations into their own agendas for education.

Spiral Discourse

The hui can be also seen as a metaphor for an indigenous means of addressing systemic change and realising the desire for self-determination by Maori people. Attempts to address this desire within Western approaches to research tend to focus on the concepts of empowerment or emancipation. One such school of thought is represented by those who promote action research as guided by critical theory. However, Robinson (1993) identified one serious limitation of the action research/critical approach to addressing systemic change is that

> paradoxically, while critical researchers locate the powerful in their analyses of problems, they exclude them from their solutions. The exclusion or bypassing of the powerful is counterproductive, given critical theorists' own claims that they (the powerful) are frequently partially responsible for the problem, through their direct or indirect control of the economic, political or communicative practices which sustain it. Unless revolutionary change is advocated or contemplated,

> social change requires the involvement of the powerful in the process of education and action designed to serve the critically examined interests of all (p. 236)

The story of the development of the Otago Maori Education Plan demonstrates a Maori cultural means of addressing systemic change. This is accomplished by involving 'the powerful', that is, those able to effect change, in the process of collaborative storying. Just as at a hui where the discourse spirals to bring all views to bear, research can also be conducted as a process of *spiral discourse.* Initially, in the process a voice is gathered, then by continuing the spiral, it is heard by 'the powerful'. These people are then brought into the project. In other words, the powerful are brought 'on board' . Those people who are able to address the concerns of the research group are incorporated into the problem solving team. The research process incorporates into the process of change those people who are necessary to address change and to challenge policy-making by outsiders. In this manner those powerful people who are normally beyond the solution seeking realm of research can be brought on board the agenda of the research and aid in promoting benefits. For example, the presentation of the Otago Maori Education Plan to representatives of the Ministry of Education was done in such a way as to suggest that they join with the local people's representatives in solution seeking and locally oriented policy making discussions. Currently these negotiations are taking place.

The concept of the spiral not only speaks in culturally preferred terms (the fern or koru), but it also indicates that the accumulation is always reflexive. This means that the discourse always returns to the original initiators where control lies. In the case of the Otago Maori Education Plan, the control lay with the mana whenua runanga. Spiralling and reflexive discourse ensured that the control of the agenda of the research was not usurped by the interests and concerns of those brought 'on board'. Spiralling discourse ensures that the group focuses on the agenda of the research as defined by Maori people. Unless such a process is an integral part of the discursive practice, the accumulation of discourses may wrest control away from Maori people.

5. The Second Study: Adapting Curriculum at a Local College of Education.

Another example of spiral discourse as a research process is provided in the second study. In this study a member of the research group who was involved in a collaborative attempt to adapt the curriculum of a local College of Education. The curriculum adaptation sought to meet the cultural aspirations and needs of an increasing number of mature Maori

students . These students were feeling culturally marginalised at an institution they felt was monocultural in its organisation.

The students, one of whom was the researcher, shared the convictions of Ohia (1989), Smith (1992), Irwin (1992) and Walker (1990), that more Maori teachers are necessary in schools in order to provide positive achievement-oriented role models and deliver their curriculum in a manner appropriate for Maori children. More Maori teachers are needed to challenge the control and domination of school structures, curricula and decision making processes by the Pakeha majority[10]. The students felt that the College of Education should be more pro-active in its recruitment policies and practices, and ensure that Maori were appropriately trained to address Maori Education needs. The need for more Maori teachers is becoming more and more imperative with the rapid growth of Maori medium educational contexts throughout New Zealand.

The students commenced their project by identifying the problems as the Maori students saw them. They identified four areas that needed to be worked on if structural reform was to be instigated on the campus:

1. the welfare and academic success of the Maori students in their first year of training.

2. the policies, practices and procedures affecting Maori students in relationship to the College charter and philosophy.

3. the professional development of thenon-Maori staff in terms of understanding the cultural learning preferences, understandings and aspirations of the Maori community.

4. Einpowerment of a group of final-year students to meet their own training needs in the field of Maori education.

By focussing on research for change as a collaborative spiral, students identified people who could facilitate solutions.. They identified that rather that the research group consisting of just the Maori students, it needed to incorporate all the other students and the staff as well. Indeed other students needed to be brought into the dialogue in order to reduce resistance and possible misunderstandings of the aspirations of the Maori students. Non-Maori staff needed to be part of the storying as they were those who could facilitate change.

The students as researchers identified the need to incorporate others into their project by concentrating on the areas of conflict within the institution. It then became a matter of utilising the power of this wider group of participants to work towards solutions. They were really surprised at the speed with which structural reform was accomplished. While resistance was encountered, it provided a context for ongoing dialogue between the

interested parties. The key to the process was identifying who the participants in this project should be. As long as the students focussed only on themselves as participants, they were frustrated because all they could do was identify problems, structural limitations and barriers. However, by widening the participant group to include those who were seen as barriers to change, institutional change was achieved.

6. The third study: Initiating research: Rejecting empowerment.

Another of the research projects illustrates how Maori socio-cultural processes associated with the hui can be used to initiate research. The researcher, a non-Maori Professor of Education, proficient in reading instruction and tutoring procedures, was already part of a wider Maori network that dealt with special needs education. In early 1992 he was invited to accompany a group of Maori educators to a regional hui for Maori special needs educators. It was suggested that he might like to present some of his ideas about reading tutoring processes in the Maori language to the local people. He did this at the hui by invoking another Maori metaphor, the koha (gift). When he attended the hui, he presented his ideas about reading tutoring in Maori, and laid them down as a koha (gift) for others to pick up as they saw fit.

He was invoking a traditional part of most hui. The koha at a hui is generally a gift or an offering of assistance towards the cost of running the hui. In the past, this koha was often a gift of food to contribute to the running of the hui. However, nowadays it is usually money that is laid down between the two groups. This placing of the money on the ground between the hosts and the visitors is usually done by the last speaker of the visitors' side. It is placed in such a position as to be able to be acknowledged and considered by the hosts. It is not usually given directly into the hands of the hosts. Whatever the specific details of the protocol, the process of 'laying down' a koha is a very powerful recognition of the right of others to self-determination; it is for them to pick up, when and as they see fit. The hosts can choose whether they want to join with the visitors. Symbolically, by picking up the koha, the hosts are taking on the initiatives of the guests. The business the guests laid down at the hui is now the 'property' of the whole whanau, hosts and guests.[11] (The whanau is literally an extended family, but is used metaphorically at a hui to address all the participants). It is now the task of the whole whanau to deliberate the issues and to own the problems, concerns and ideas in a way that demonstrates commitment to this connectedness. All will now work for the betterment of the idea.

By invoking this process of laying down a koha, this research study was initiated within Maori ways of knowing. As such, laying down a koha as a means of initiating

research, or of offering solutions to a problem, challenges notions of empowerment, a major concern within contemporary Western research. It challenges what constitutes 'self' and 'other' in Western thought. Rather than figuratively saying "I am giving you power", or "I intend to empower you", the laying down of a koha and stepping away for the others to consider your gift, that is your potential contribution as a researcher, means that your mana is intact, as is theirs. You as a researcher are indicating that you don't want anything from it. It is up to the others to exert agency, to decide if they wish to pick it up. Whatever they do, both sides have power throughout the process. Both sides have tapu (spirituality) that is being acknowledged. In this sense, researchers are repositioned so as to no longer need to seek to *give voice to others*, to *empower* others, to *emancipate* others, to refer to others as *subjugated voices,* but rather to listen to and participate with those traditionally 'othered' as agents of knowledge and constructors of meaning from shared experiences.

The researcher participated in a process that facilitated the development in people of a sense of themselves as agentic and of having an authoritative voice. This is not a result of the researcher 'allowing' this to happen or of 'empowering' the participants. It was a function of the cultural context within which the researcher participated. The cultural context enabled all the participants to construct the story lines, embodying culturally appropriate metaphors and images. Thus the joint development of new story-lines was a collaborative effort. What makes the process Maori was that it was done using Maori metaphor within a Maori cultural context.

7. The Fourth Study: My family study.

The story of own family study provides a further example of the process of collaborative storying. This study illustrates how people involved in collaborative storying are not just informants, but rather are participants with meaningful experiences and explanations of their own.

My family study attempted to understand the reasons for the Europeanisation of my mother's family, the subsequent cultural and geographic dispersal of the family and the denial of its Maori heritage. I developed a draft story using the Gramscian concept of hegemony (Bishop, 1991b) to explain how the persuasiveness of ideas could enable colonisation of the mind to occur. This approach sought to explain why the majority of the fourteen siblings of my grandfather chose to raise their children in the culture of their father, that is as Pakeha, and not in the culture of their mother, that is as Maori. Further, this concept of hegemony was used to explain why the information about our ancestry was suppressed and knowledge of our Maori heritage was not passed on.

However, meeting with other family genealogists and historians, and talking with them and other members of the family on numerous occasions, led me to realise that these people had many of their own explanations for the actions and beliefs of our ancestors. These alternative explanations not only challenged my application of an outside theory but also challenged my position as a researcher within the research group. My position became more a position as a member of the family than a position as a university researcher.

I learned also that the other family historians and genealogists did not want to hand over their knowledge to me to take away. They wanted to sit down with me and participate in developing a joint understanding. They wanted to develop a system where we could work together toward constructing a mutual understanding, a collaborative story, about what had happened to our family.[12] Such a process challenges: Who is responsible for processing information? Who has authority over the sense making processes and the means of constructing meaning and seeking explanations? These are issues of representation and legitimation. Further challenges posed by the collaborative storying process include: Who writes the account of the research process? and more importantly: Who judges it to be fair? (Tripp, 1983. p. 34).

Maori cultural practices associated with the hui address these challenges. These cultural practices were used literally and figuratively in this study to develop the collective voice by a means of spiral discourse. Spiral discourse within interviews or rather sequences of interviews in the study meant that the interpretation, analysis, and theorising took place as part of the interaction. These collective, sequential, reflective interactions produce a collaborative story of the understandings of the research participants. Interpreting and "making sense" of experiences was not left until afterwards, to be conducted by the researcher, as suggested in many current thematic analysis methods (as in Eisner, 1991) or in Grounded Theory approaches (as described in Burgess, 1984, Delamont 1992, and Strauss and Corbin 1994). Rather, as with the hui, the process of collaborative storying was holistic and continuous. Gathering, interpretation and analysis of experience tookplace at the same time, as part of an ongoing series of 'hui'.

For example, I sent copies of my draft story about the family to the other family historians. Many responded extensively. The response of just one of these historians illustrates the collaborative construction of meaning fundamental to this process. Two weeks after posting the text, I received the first of four letters from this particular family historians disagreeing with my story and challenging the information I had gathered from other members of her sub-family, and from other members of the wider family. She had been to see other people mentioned in the text to verify her suspicions and had written extensive notes over the text. She was very whakama (shy) about being so picky with 'my'

text. However, I rang her to explain that I was thrilled that she had spent so much time on the text and that it was my intention that she do so. However, we were clearly not understanding each other's approach on the telephone, so we decided we needed to meet face to face. We spent three days together thrashing out the issues, commenting on each other's ideas, going over source material and working towards a consensus. This was done in the most hospitable manner possible. I was made most welcome and we attacked the issues with gusto. Following my return home, I received four more letters; this time they were supportive and offered more ideas and thoughts.

Collaborative storying is not limited to a lineal sequence of gaining access, data gathering, data processing then theorising. In this approach the image of a spiral, a koru is suggested as one that describes the process of continually revisiting the agenda of the research, as Heshusius (1994) suggests where "reality is no longer to be understood as truth to be interpreted, but as mutually evolving." (p. 18)

Talking with other researchers in the family over a period of years eventually changed my study from one where I sought data to conform to a theory to one where we began to negotiate the meaning of the data in order to co-jointly construct a collaborative story.

Issues of authority and validity

The question of who was likely to have the authority to be part of the family research group was a problem to me initially. The members of this family number in the thousands. How was it possible to interact meaningfully and more importantly, authoritatively, with such a vast array of people? How were issues of validity, accountability, and control to be addressed when constructing a collaborative story in such a context?

The answer was to emerge out of the very process of the research. One day in May of 1990 my brother and I were talking with a kaumatua (elder) and others about our search for our whanaunga (relatives). Jim Ritchie, an eminent scholar and member of Waikato University's Maori Research Unit, offered an explanation for the phenomena of our search for our tupuna (ancestors). He explained that it was a "typical third generation search" that followed an unpleasant emigration, or the escape from horrific circumstances. He explained that typically, the first generation did not want to talk about the events surrounding their departure. The second generation were so busy consolidating their new situation that they too didn't want to talk about it. It was the third generation who strove to seek out the dispersed family structure, all the time hoping to understand the hidden reasons behind the dispersal of the first generation.

Ritchie's explanation was very valuable for it enabled me to identify potential participants in the research group. By this time, I was engaged in discovering the network of existing family historians and genealogists. I was already beginning to get in touch with them, but I needed this insight to realise that the family already had a process for identifying those members who were part of the wide research group that I was belatedly becoming part of. Also, it became clear why these were the people who could speak authoritatively on behalf of their particular sections of the family. Interestingly, these people were invariably members of the third generation.

In all families there are people who are selected or acknowledged by the family members to be the recorders of whakapapa (genealogy). It is such an important task that in the past it was ascribed to a carefully selected member of the family. With colonisation however, it appears to the casual eye, to have been left to chance. However, there remains a very specific and continuous process of checks and verifications by others in the family as to the veracity of the incumbent. The family researchers were people 'verified' by others. By their interest in the history and the cultural diaspora of the family they had submitted themselves to the scrutiny of the rest of their branch of the family. This verification is a very fluid process that ranges from informal day to day contacts, to copious letter writing and participation in numerous hui (formal meetings) and korero (talking) sessions, through to the organisation of family reunions. As a result, it to say that members of the family know very well who is able to speak with authority and of whom it is worth taking notice. This process has enabled a vast network of opinions and attitudes to be canvassed and represented when family matters and research questions are discussed, when collaborative stories are to be constructed.

The research group in this study was not a finite group whose validity was determined by the researcher, for example, by means of establishing a 'sample'. The research group is ever-expanding, and the validity of the selection process, in being decided by the family, takes the control over the validation of data-processing methods out of the hands of the researcher and places it in the processes that already exist within the culture of the family. This approach addresses the power differential between the researcher and the researched. Neither have the complete power, since the power resides in the group and in the group processes. To remove the control of identifying the research group from the preferred methods of the researcher to the preferred methods within which the research group works, places the issue of validity of the process of selection and information verification onto both the researcher and the researched as research participants. Such an approach is necessary in order for Maori people to gain the power to resist outsiders determining what constitutes validity for them.

8. The fifth study: Tu Mai kia Tu Ake

Collaborative storying establishes relationships in which the researcher becomes inextricably involved. Inextricably involved in the sense that Oakley (1981) identifies where "personal involvement is more than dangerous bias, it is the condition under which people come to know each other and admit others into their lives." (p. 58)

Such personal involvement in research is well illustrated by the research project undertaken by a very unique member of the research group. He is a kaumatua (elder) of the Kai Tahu, Kati Mamoe and Waitaha people (the local tribes) of the South Island. He has a unique background because he is one of the few remaining native speakers of the Southern dialect of the Maori language. He was educated in the language and culture of the South by his grandmother, great-grandmother and cousins. It was this upbring in the culture and language of the Southern Maori that influenced how he undertook and understood his experiences as a researcher.

During 1992 and 1993 he was seconded from his position as Principal of a local primary school to the University of Otago's Education Department as a Research Affiliate. While on secondment he undertook two interrelated research projects. The first project sought to evaluate the impact of Taha Maori[13] on clusters of schools in Otago and Southland. The second was to return to the participants of the first research project a compendium of Southern Maori stories that he had learnt in his youth.

The first project developed as a collaborative story in the manner described earlier. He invoked the process of the hui to identify problems and negotiate solutions with the others involved in the research.

It was the second of the two projects, however, that illustrates the importance of identifying the personal involvement of the researcher. His personal training as a tohunga (expert in Maori knowledge) is inextricably tied into his actions as researcher. Elbow (1986 in Connelly and Clandinin, 1990) identifies the interconnectedness of knowledge and action as a form of connected knowing where the "knower is attached to the known," (p. 4) or as what Berman (in Heshusius, 1994) calls somatic or bodily knowing and what Ballard (1994) refers to as embodied knowing.

This kaumatua recalled that in the ten years prior to this study he had often been questioned about appropriate strategies for introducing Maori knowledge into school programmes. During this time and when he first approached the schools who took part in the research project, there was an initial tendency for him to attempt to answer the questions as and when he could. However, he and the questioners became frustrated with this type of approach for he was unable to provide satisfactory answers, that is answers that

did not require another set of questions to clarify the first answer. The basic problem was that he and the people in the schools were talking from two different cultural contexts and epistemological systems. Such frustration led him to suggest an alternative strategy based on his training as a tohunga. He decided to offer to develop a compendium of resources for use in training and teaching. These resources could contribute to the development of the theme of Taha Maori, but this time as defined and determined by Maori, not by non-Maori peoples

His teaching method followed that of a traditional tohunga (expert). This approach consisted of the elders as teachers, selecting students who showed sufficient aptitude. The elders then designed a process for passing on knowledge to students in such a way as to meet their abilities and interests. He followed a similar procedure in the modern setting. His approach was to offer some teachings at a variety of levels, using the key to the culture, the language, as the means of selecting those pupils/schools who were serious enough to put in the time necessary to unlock the new knowledge. In practice, he provided the knowledge the others wanted to learn but only at a simple level in English. Knowledge of a more complex nature he felt was best presented in standard Maori. However, the most complex and deep knowledge was presented in the language of the Southern Maori, the original context of this knowledge. In this sense, he linked the schools into a continuum of tauira (students) that stretches right throughout his own people's tribes of Kai Tahu, Kati Mamoe and Waitaha.

Approaches to knowledge

This project also illustrates that Maori do not necessarily pass on knowledge and information universally (as is explained in Marsden, 1975; Rangihau, 1975; King, 1978; Pere, 1982 and Metge, 1984). Some knowledge and expertise belongs only to certain people. Knowledge is passed on personally and the specific social contexts of transmission are critical. Orally-acquired and transmitted knowledge, so frequently devalued and belittled by non-Maori educational researchers, is highly valued by Maori. Waiata (song) and moteatea (poetry), for example, are valued not just for their entertainment value, but also because they are preferred means of transmitting culture and information. Knowledge is a taonga (treasure) handed down as 'taonga tuku iho', that is, as a precious gift from the ancestors, and as such is tapu (sacred). Knowledge enhances

such power, and is expressed in the form of personal power known as mana. How it is used is crucial.

To Maori people, knowledge gathering and processing is not just an epistemological nor a methodological issue to be debated in public by academics. It is an issue fundamental to Maori society. There are existing, long standing prohibitions and cultural benefits ascribed to the research processes of knowledge production and definition. Knowledge is powerful and is to be treasured and protected for the benefit of the group, not for the individual. Knowledge is not just there for the researcher to collect and publish. Rather, the gaining of new knowledge in a Maori context is to enhance the lives of all the participants involved. In effect, there is a strong cultural preference for research to be conducted in a participatory manner. In this manner the researcher is inextricably and consciously connected to the processes and outcomes of the research.

Such understandings explain why in Maori contexts researchers do not necessarily have the right to full access to knowledge. In some cases this may be a permanent barrier. In others it is necessary to return again and again and to participate in the context until the researcher has developed enough credibility and trust to be seen an worthy of the knowledge. My family study illustrated to me the need to both establish relationships in a culturally appropriate manner and to demonstrate that I would respect the tapu of knowledge. One particular conversation illustrates this approach. We were at a family reunion committee meeting. He called me aside during the meeting and the following conversation took place, covering the issues of accountability and ownership of knowledge.

Family I have saved the first stanza of a chant that an old man in Rotorua chanted to my Dad when we were travelling through, but its language is a bit delicate for Western ears. (He recited the stanza, and continued) that's the only part of the thing that I can remember, because as you know I wasn't raised with the language and so there was a whole lot of other stuff.

Self You said that you didn't tell me that beforehand. Why didn't you tell me that?

Family When your book came back, from the front page to the back page, it said to me 'This fellow had finally arrived as far as Maori/Pakeha is concerned'. I know

you have been arriving all the time and so you understand what had actually happened to our family.

Self At that point you realised that I could actually have the knowledge?

Family Yes, I felt safe in giving you the knowledge, I felt safe in giving you those things that had happened to me personally.

9. Overview: Collaborative Storying as Research.

The researchers in the five studies participated in constructing collaborative stories with the other research participants. The collaborative stories were constructed within specific Maori cultural processes, all of which are typically associated with the hui. Further, reflection on the experiences of the five researchers in my project emphasises the value of the hui as a metaphor for collaborative storying. In this sense the hui was used to construct the stories within my project about the stories in the five research studies. This process took place within the agreed-to agenda of a Kaupapa Maori framework of research. In this sense, the hui as a metaphor was used to orient a sequence of semi-structured, in-depth interviews as conversations, along with informal 'interviews as chat' (after Haig-Brown 1992), to develop collaborative stories.

The interviews for my project were conducted within a context where there had been a ritual of encounter, a metaphoric 'powhiri' (welcome) process. There was also an expression of commitment to engage in each others' concerns and interests. This was a reflection of the common commitment to the shared agenda of the research group. The in-depth conversational interviews and the less formal interviews as chat used in the meta-study were constituted within ways of knowing that facilitate interpretation and theorising by those concerned. Such an understanding illustrates a collaborative strategy for constructing shared meaning. In this way in-depth interviews can go beyond mere data collecting, beyond seeing the other participants merely as informants. The aim is to facilitate the sharing of power, to minimise the impositional tendencies of the researcher and in this case by reflection and example to promote action for the betterment of Maori people.

Collaborative storying as a research approach also addresses issues of legitimation. Lincoln & Denzin (1994) explain this understanding as an epistemological approach to validity. This is where the authority of the text is "established through recourse to a set of rules concerning knowledge, its production and representation" (p. 578). Such an approach to validity locates the power within Maori cultural practices where what is acceptable and

what is not acceptable research, text and/or process is determined and defined by the Maori community itself. Maori practices are epistemologically validated within Maori cultural contexts, the use of these practices within the research process are subject to the same culturally determined processes of validation, the same rules concerning knowledge, its production and its representation as are any use of these practices. Further, the verification of a text, the authority of a text, how well it represents the experiences and perspective of the participants, is judged by criteria constructed and constituted within the culture. Further, using Maori socio-cultural processes as metaphors for the research process invokes and claims authority for these texts in terms of the principles, processes and practices that govern such events in their literal sense. Research constituted within Maori metaphor is governed by the same principles and processes that govern the literal counterpart, and as such is understandable to and controllable by Maori people.

The examination of the five research studies demonstrated that researchers understood themselves to be involved somatically in the research process. To be involved somatically means to be involved bodily, that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually, not just in one's capacity as a 'researcher' concerned with methodology. Such involvement is constituted as a way of knowing, that is fundamentally different from the concepts of personal investment and collaboration as suggested in traditional approaches to research. For, while it appears that 'personal investment' is essential, this personal investment is not on terms determined by the 'investor'. The investment is on terms mutually understandable and controllable by all participants, so that the investment is reciprocal and could not be otherwise. The 'personal investment' by the researcher is not an act by an individual agent but emerges out of the context within which the research is constituted..

Traditional conceptualisations of knowing do not adequately accommodate this understanding. Heshusius (1994) suggests the need to move from an alienated mode of consciousness which sees the knower as separate from the known to a participatory mode of consciousness. This latter way of knowing is where there is common understanding and a common basis for such an understanding. Such is the situation in collaborative stories, a situation where the concerns, interests and agendas of the researcher become the concerns, interests and agendas of the researched and vice versa. Participatory consciousness addresses a fundamental reordering of our understanding of the relationship between self and other "and indeed between self and the world, in a manner where such a reordering, not only includes connectedness, but necessitates letting go of the focus on self" (p. 15).

By constituting research in indigenous contexts as a process of collaborative storying we address the situation that Heshusius (1995) describes as when "the self of the

knower and the larger self of the community of inquiry are, from the very starting point, intimately woven into the very fabric of that which we claim as knowledge and of what we agree to be the proper ways by which we make knowledge claims. It is to say that the knower and the known are one movement. Moreover, any inquiry is an expression of a particular other-self relatedness" (p. 3).

The stories told by the researchers in the five studies discussed demonstrates how the researchers had become located within new 'story-lines' that address the contradictory nature of the traditional researcher/researched relationship. The language used contains the key to the new story-lines; the metaphor and imagery are those located within the research participants' domain and the researchers either were moving or have moved to become part of this domain.

In conclusion, this paper suggests that a means of addressing indigenous peoples' desire for self-determination in educational research is to develop collaborative storying as a research approach. Such an approach, when conducted within indigenous ways of knowing, facilitates ongoing collaborative analysis and construction of meaning and explanations about the lived experiences of all the research participants.

---

[1] A number of authors (Walker, 1979; Curtis, 1983; Stokes, 1985, 1987; L. Smith, 1991; G. Smith, 1992; Irwin, 1992; Bishop & Glynn, 1992, Bishop, 1994, 1995, 1996) have detailed the concerns Maori people feel about the impact of research into their lives.

[2] Two peoples created the nation of New Zealand when in 1840 lieutenant-Governor Hobson and the chiefs of New Zealand signed the Treaty of Waitangi on behalf of the British Crown and the Maori descendants of New Zealand. The Treaty is seen as a charter for power sharing in the decision making processes of this country, and for Maori determination of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand (Walker, 1990).

[3] Literally a dispersal.

[4] These were the decades immediately after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi when the struggle for sovereignty was at its height.

[5] Kaupapa Maori research emerged from within the wider ethnic revitalisation movement that developed in New Zealand following the rapid Maori urbanisation of the post World War two period. This revitalisation movement blossomed in the 1970's and 1980's with the intensifying of a political consciousness among Maori communities. More recently, in the late 1980's and the early 1990's, this consciousness has featured the revitalisation of Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and resistance to the hegemony of the dominant discourse.

Kaupapa Maori research seeks to operationalise self-determination (known as tino Rangatiratanga or chiefly control in Maori) by Maori people (G. Smith, 1990; L. Smith 1991; Bishop, 1991a). Such an approach challenges the locus of power and control over the research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability, being located in another cultural frame of reference/world view. Kaupapa Maori is challenging the dominance of traditional, individualistic research which primarily, at least in its present form, benefits the researcher and their agenda. In contrast, Kaupapa Maori research is collectivistic, and is orientated toward benefiting all the research participants and their collectively determined agendas, defining and acknowledging Maori aspirations for research, whilst developing and implementing Maori theoretical and methodological preferences and practices for research.

Kaupapa Maori is a discourse that has emerged and is legitimated from within the Maori

Community. Maori educationalist, Graham Smith (1992) describes Kaupapa Maori as "the philosophy and practice of 'being and acting Maori'" (p. 1). It assumes the taken-for-granted social, political, historical, intellectual and cultural legitimacy of Maori people, in that it is a position where "Maori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right" (p. 13).

[6]after Smith, L.T. (1991) and Smith, G.H. (1992) ; and expanded in Bishop, R. (1991a;, 1995).

[7] For more detailed descriptions of such events see Salmond (1975), Shirres (1982), Irwin (1992)

[8] Mana whenua are the indigenous people of the particular region, whose genealogy is located in that place. They are the people of first reference in Maori affairs because they are the tangata whenua (the indigenous people) of that particular place. Other Maori people living in the region as a result of recent migration for employment or education, and whose genealogy is located in another region are termed mata waka, that is people of another canoe.

[9] The Education Service providers who participated in one or more of these meetings included: Ministry of Education, Education Review Office, Special Education Service, Quest Rapuara, Education and Training Support Agency, National Library Service, Kura Kaupapa Maori, University of Otago, Dunedin College of Education, Otago Polytechnic, Te Puni Kokiri, New Zealand Schools Trustees Association.

[10]Pakeha is the Maori term for New Zealanders of European, usually English, descent.

[11]Whanau is a primary concept (a cultural preference) that underlies the narratives of Kaupapa Maori research practice. This concept contains both values (cultural aspirations) and social processes (cultural practices). The root word of whanau literally means family in its broad 'extended' sense. However the word 'whanau' is increasingly being used in a metaphoric sense. This generic concept of whanau subsumes other related concepts; whanaunga (relatives), whanaungatanga (relationships), whakawhanaungatanga (the process of establishing relationships) and whakapapa (literally, the means of establishing relationships). (The prefix 'whaka' means 'to make'; the suffix 'tanga' has a naming function).

[12]To my delight I found that the people I approached were not only 'interested' but they were already expert genealogists on their particular family branches. There was already a loose form of contact between some of them going back some thirty years in some cases. There were some who had lost interest but the vast majority were without exception enthusiastic to allow me to participate and collaborate with them in what became our project.

[13]Taha Maori was an initiative of the former Department of Education in the early 1980s, in response to the growing call among Maori and non-Maori educators for some recognition of the place of Maori as tangata whenua (indigenous people) in Aotearoa. Many Maori have criticised the approach because although it commenced with the ideal of addressing Maori children's under achievement in schools, because of the underlying philosophy of the programme it failed to address Maori needs and only spoke to non-Maori people about Maori. This approach sought to add a Maori perspective to a curriculum, the central core of which was decided by the majority culture, rather than include Maori world views as any substantial component in the curriculum planning process.

References

Ballard, K. (Ed.). (1994). *Disability, family, whanau and society*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Bishop, R. (1991a). *Te ropu rangahau tikanga rua: The need for emancipatory research under the control of the Maori people for the betterment of Maori people.* In H. Manson (Eds.), *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*. Wellington: Victoria University.

Bishop, R. (1991b) Ko te whakawhanaungatanga tikanga rua. Unpublished MA thesis. University of Otago.

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29 (1), 1-14

Bishop, R. (1995) Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga. Unpublished PhD thesis. Education Department. University of Otago, New Zealand.

Bishop, R. (1996) Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga. Palmerston North. Dunmore Press.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1992). He kanohi kitea: Conducting and evaluating educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 27 (2), 125-135.

Burgess, R. G. (1984). *In the field: An introduction to field research*. New York: Falmer Press.

Connelly, M. & Clandinin, J. (1990) Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*. June-July. 2- 14.

Curtis, T. (1983). *A maori viewpoint related in research in maori education.* Discussion Paper, Auckland College of Education.

Delamont, S. (1992) *Fieldwork in educational settings: Methods, pitfalls and perspectives.* London: The Falmer Press.

Eisner, E. W. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice.* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Heshusius, L. (1994) Freeing ourselves from objectivity: Managing subjectivity or turning toward a participatory mode of consciousness? *Educational Researcher* 23 (3) 15-22.

Heshusius, L. (1995) *Modes of consciousness and the self in learning disabilities research. Considering past and present.* Unpublished paper.

Haig-Brown, C. (1992). Choosing border work. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 19* (1) 96-116

Irwin, K. (1992). *Maori research methods and processes: An exploration and discussion.* Paper presented to the joint New Zealand Association for Research in Education/Australian Association for Research in Education Conference. Geelong, Australia.

Jackson. M, (1994) seminar to Community and Family Studies Department. University of Otago.

King, M. (1978) Some maori attitudes to documents. in M, King. (Ed.), *Tihei Mauriora: Aspects of maoritanga.* Auckland: Longman Paul.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (1994). The fifth moment. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp. 575-586). London: Sage.

Marsden, M. (1975) God, man and the universe: A maori view. in King, M. (ed) *Te Ao Hurihuri: The world moves on.* (pp. 143-164) Auckland: Longman Paul.

Metge, J. (1984) *He tikanga maori: Learning and teaching.* Wellington: Department of Education.

Middleton, S. (1985) *Feminism and education in post war New Zealand: A sociological analysis.* Unpublished PhD thesis University of Waikato.

Oakley, A. (1981) Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. in Roberts, H (ed) *Doing Feminist Research.* London: Routledge.

Ohia, M. (1989). *Research for Maori education.* An address to the New Zealand Association for Research in Education Conference, Trentham.

Pere, R. (1982) *Ako: Concepts and learning in the maori tradition.* Hamilton: Department of Sociology, University of Waikato.

Rangihau, J. (1975). Being Maori. In M. King (Ed.),*Te ao hurihuri, the world moves on: Aspects of Maoritanga,* Auckland: Hicks Smith

Robinson, V. (1993). *Problem based methodology: Research for the improvement of practice.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Said, E. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Salmond, A. (1975)*Hui: A study of Maori ceremonial greetings.* Auckland: Reed and Methuen.

Shirres, M. (1982). Tapu. *Journal of the Polynesian Society.* 91 (1) 29-52.

Smith, G. H. (1990) Taha maori: Pakeha capture. In J. Codd, R. Harker and R. Nash (Eds.), *Political Issues in New Zealand Education.* (pp.183-197) Palmerston North: Dunmore Press Limited

Smith, G. H. (1992). *Research issues related to Maori education* (The Issue of Research and Maori Monograph No. 9). Department of Education, University of Auckland.

Smith, L.T. (1991) Te rapuna i te ao marama: Maori perspectives on research in education. In Morss J.R and Linzey, T.J (Eds.),*The Politics of Human Learning: Human Development and Educational Research.* (pp. 46-55). Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Stokes, E. (1985). *Maori research and development: Discussion paper,* Social Sciences Research Committee of National Research and Advisory Council.

Stokes, E. (1987) Maori geography or geography of maori. *New Zealand Geographer,* 4 (3), 118-123.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273-285). London: Sage Publications.

Tripp, D. H. (1983). Co-authorship and negotiation: The interview as act of creation. *Interchange: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 14* (3), 32-45.

Walker, R. (1979). A consumer view of research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies,* 14 (Supplement), 91-93.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end.* Auckland: Penguin

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").